

## **REMARKS**

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated April 13, 2010, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on July 13, 2010. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claims 1, 2, 4-13, and 30-38 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 2, 4-13 and 30-38 remain pending following entry of this response. Claims 1, 8-10, 30-32, 36 and 38 have been amended. Applicants submit that the amendments do not introduce new matter.

Further, Applicants are not conceding in this application that those amended claims are not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner, as the present claim amendments are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution of the claimed subject matter. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue these (pre-amended claims) and other claims in one or more continuations and/or divisional patent applications.

### Statement of Substance of Interview

On July 1, 2010, a telephonic interview was held between Casey S. Parks (attorney, Reg. #62,921) and the Examiner. Claim 1 was discussed. The parties also discussed proposed amendments to claim 1. The proposed amendments are reflected in this response.

During the interview, Applicants argued that the proposed amendments to claim 1 would make the claim allowable, in light of the Examiner's indication in the Office Action that the previous claim 9 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. The Examiner agreed that claim 1 would be allowable if amended as discussed.

### Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejects claims 1-2, 4-8, 10-13, 30-38 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), arguing the claims are unpatentable over *Zalewski et al.*, Patent No. 6,260,068 (hereafter *Zalewski*) in view of *Polcyn*, Patent No. 5,951,633 (hereafter *Polcyn*).

The Examiner states that "Claim 9 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims." Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 9, and as such, is believed to be allowable. Independent claims 10, 30 and 36 were rejected for substantially the same reasons and have been amended in substantially the same way. As claim 1 is believed to be allowable, claims 10, 30 and 36, as well as all dependent claims, are allowable as well. Therefore, all claims are believed to be allowable, and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

#### Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 9 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants respectfully acknowledge the allowable subject matter. As discussed above, all claims as amended are believed to be allowable.

#### Conclusion

Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted, and  
**S-signed pursuant to 37 CFR 1.4,**

/Gero G. MCCLELLAN, Reg. #44227/

---

Gero G. McClellan  
Registration No. 44,227  
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.  
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500  
Houston, TX 77056  
Telephone: (713) 623-4844  
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846  
**Attorney for Applicant(s)**